

**THE INDIANAPOLIS MARION COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT  
CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** October 26, 2005

**CALLED TO ORDER:** 5:40 p.m.

**ADJOURNED:** 7:21 p.m.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Attending Members**

Mary Moriarty Adams, Chairwoman  
Lonnell Conley  
Ron Gibson  
Dane Mahern  
Lincoln Plowman  
William Oliver  
Joanne Sanders

**Absent Members**

Lynn McWhirter  
Marilyn Pfisterer

**AGENDA**

**PROPOSAL NO. 471, 2005** - amends the Code to establish a metropolitan law enforcement agency through the consolidation of the Indianapolis Police Department and the Marion County Sheriff's Department, to establish a transition advisory board and make other provisions to ensure that such consolidation proceeds in an orderly fashion, and to make corresponding technical changes to numerous sections of the Code  
"Amended and Held for Further Study"

Vote: 5-1

## THE INDIANAPOLIS MARION COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE

The Indianapolis Marion County Law Enforcement Consolidation Committee of the City-County Council met on Thursday, October 26, 2005. Chairwoman Mary Moriarty Adams called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. with the following members present: Lonnell Conley, Dane Mahern, Lincoln Plowman, William Oliver, and Joanne Sanders. Arriving shortly thereafter was Ron Gibson. Absent were Lynn McWhirter, and Marilyn Pfisterer. Also in attendance were President Steve Talley, Councillors Patrice Abdullah, Scott Keller, and Jackie Nytes; Aaron Haith, General Counsel, and Bart Brown, the Chief Financial Officer for the City-County Council.

PROPOSAL NO. 471, 2005 - amends the Code to establish a metropolitan law enforcement agency through the consolidation of the Indianapolis Police Department and the Marion County Sheriff's Department, to establish a transition advisory board and make other provisions to ensure that such consolidation proceeds in an orderly fashion, and to make corresponding technical changes to numerous sections of the Code

{Clerks note: President Talley read verbatim a statement, which is attached as Exhibit A.}

Mr. Haith reviewed all of the highlighted amendments in Proposal No. 471, 2005.

Councillor Plowman asked if the salaries of merit employees in each department would be made equal. Mr. Haith said that would be left up to the Steering committee, to the Advisory committee, and then to the Transition Authority. The Council cannot make that decision.

Councillor Sanders moved, seconded by Councillor Conley, to "amend" Proposal No. 471, 2005, which is on file in the Council's office as Exhibit A. The motion carried by a vote of 5-1 with Councillor Plowman casting the negative vote.

Councillor Plowman asked if anyone knew how much the tax rate would go up should there be a consolidation. Mr. Brown stated that if there is equalization of the tax rate for the combined departments there are scenarios where the rate could increase, rate could decrease, and the rate could stay the same; it just depends on what the budget is. He said the worst case scenario is that taxes will increase.

{Clerks note: Councillor Gibson arrived at 6:44 p.m. and Councillor Conley left at 6:37 p.m.}

Chairwoman Moriarty Adams stated that Sheriff Frank Anderson wanted everyone to know that he is not yet in total agreement with the amendments that were presented tonight. She said that the Sheriff and the Mayor are continuing to talk and work through the amendments.

The following people spoke in support of consolidation: State Representative Bill Crawford, Sue Swayze, Paul Bateman, Charles Staples, Harriet Wilkens, John Walls, Clay Miller, and Don Baily.

Some key statements were:

- A Consolidation will give this City an opportunity to maintain the paramount nature of public safety in the community.
- The operation of control will achieve a certain level of efficiency and will develop a uniformed application.
- Consolidation will streamline local government and simplify public safety
- The City-County Council members were elected to make decisions and implement policy. The citizens need to trust that consolidation is the right decision.
- Consolidation is more fair to taxpayers and will be more efficient in the long run.
- A merger will help avoid layoffs and also save some cost.

The following people spoke in opposition of consolidation: Bill Schneider Marsha Clapper, R.P. Marks, Kathleen Kindred, Vince Huber, Tom Koppel, Leigh Richards, Bonnie Dotts, Bobby Allen, Steve Davis, and Kevin Kendall.

Some key statements were:

The Council should have all the facts before any consolidation should be considered. This motion should be defeated because there is no element to make a good judgment, and there is no proof for what really is going to happen should there be a consolidation.

Members of the consolidation committee are failing to apply the advice, wisdom, and experience of people in cities where consolidation has occurred.

- The process was started in a good faith manner by attempting to gather information from other cities; afterwards the process spiraled out of control to the current proposal.

The following spoke neither against nor in favor of consolidation, but had questions and concerns: Robert Yahara.

Chairwoman Moriarty Adams said that since the Council has created the Law Enforcement Consolidation committee from the responsibilities given by the Indiana General Assembly, there have been 9 committee hearings; 6 of which have been public hearings where testimony was given. There has been an enormous amount of statistics from IPD, MCSO, and the City Administration. She thanked everyone for their comments and concerns and stated to the committee members that amendments were given and should be studied, as they will be discussed and voted on at the final Law Enforcement Consolidation Committee meeting, which will be on November 7, 2005 in the Public Assembly Room at 5:30 pm.

CONCLUSION

With no further business pending, and upon motion duly made, the Administration and Finance Committee of the City-County Council was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Moriarty Adams, Chairwoman  
The Indianapolis Marion County  
Law Enforcement Consolidation  
Committee

MMA/rjp

---

THANK YOU MADAM CHAIR.

I APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS YOU, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND THE PUBLIC ON THE PROGRESS OF PROPOSAL 471

BEFORE YOU TONIGHT ARE SEVERAL AMENDMENTS DEVELOPED SINCE THIS COMMITTEE LAST MET. I PARTICULARLY WANT TO THANK MEMBERS FOR THE MANY MEETINGS THEY HAVE ATTENDED WITH MEMBERS OF THE FOP, CONSTITUTENTS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC. THE AMENDMENTS BEFORE YOU TONIGHT REFLECT WHAT WE HEARD IN THOSE MANY MEETINGS AND IS THE PRODUCT OF THAT UNDERTAKING. MEMBERS HAVE WORKED INDIVIDUALLY, AS INFORMAL WORK GROUPS AND WITH ME TO DEVELOP AND TO PRESENT THESE AMENDMENTS. EACH OF US WORKED WITH A BELIEF THAT WE COULD AND WOULD, AS A COUNCIL, CREATE A CONSOLIDATED POLICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS ACCOUNTABLE, EFFICIENT, AND EFFECTIVE.

EACH OF US CONTINUE TO WORK WITH SHERIFF ANDERSON AND MAYOR PETERSON TO ASSURE THAT THEIR INPUT IS PROPERLY REFLECTED IN EACH PROPOSED AMENDMENT. I AM SURE THAT AS WE CONTINUE TO WORK AND TO NEGOTIATE THERE WILL COME A FEW MORE AMENDMENTS FOR YOU TO CONSIDER. I FEEL REASONABLY CERTAIN THAT ANY SUCH AMENDMENTS WILL BE TO BETTER THE CONSOLIDATION AND REFLECT THE SAME THOUGHT AND INSIGHT AS THOSE BEFORE YOU TONIGHT.

PROPOSAL 471 IS BEFORE THE COUNCIL AS A RESULT OF THE  
LEGISLATURES APPROVAL AND PASSAGE OF SENATE ENROLLED ACT 307.  
IT ALLOWS US THE OPPORTUNITY TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATIVE SERVICES,  
AND TO ALLOW US THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACHIEVE THE LEGISLATORS'  
GREATER PURPOSE, NAMELY: TO PROVIDE OUR CONSOLIDATED CITY  
WITH THIS MEANS OF DELIVERING ESSENTIAL GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES  
FOR ITS CITIZENS IN AN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND FISCALLY  
RESPONSIBLE MANNER.

HEREFORE, I URGE YOUR CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE  
AMENDMENTS NOW BEFORE YOU.